UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/033,365	12/26/2001	Kim E. Lorenz	260042.473	7808

47053 7590 05/01/2006

CHRISTENSEN O'CONNOR JOHNSON KINDNESS PLLC
1420 FIFTH AVENUE
SUITE 2800
SEATTLE, WA 98101-2347

EXAMINER	
CHOWDHURY, SUMAIYA A	
ART UNIT	**PAPER NUMBER**
2623	

DATE MAILED: 05/01/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/033,365	LORENZ, KIM E.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Sumaiya A. Chowdhury	2623	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on _____.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) 1-50 is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) 1-50 is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date 1-30-03.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6) ☐ Other: _____.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

1. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

2. Claims 1, 4, 5, 7, 9-15, 20, 27-28, 34, 36 and 48 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Takahashi (6308329).

As for claims 1 and 36, Takahashi discloses a display for a client terminal for a television for an interactive video casting system, the display comprising:

a display screen (2 – Fig. 1A; col. 3, lines 17-20) coupled the client terminal (1 – Fig. 1A)

a display driver (the processor contains code to display text/images on the display device) coupled to the display screen (29 – Fig. 5), the display driver capable to cause the display screen to display screen indicia indicative of events available via the interactive video casting system through the client terminal, the screen indicia capable of being displayed on the display screen at least alternatively to being displayed on the television (col. 3, lines 15-25).

As for claim 4, Takahashi teaches wherein the screen indicia is capable of being simultaneously displayed on the television and on the display screen. Referring to Fig. 3C, the screen is attached to the television, hence it is being displayed simultaneously on the television and on the display screen - col. 3, lines 33-36.

As for claims 5 and 20, Takaashi teaches the events include news headlines and sports scores (Fig. 1A-1C; col. 3, lines 20-24)

As for claim 7, Takahashi discloses the screen indicia comprises dynamic text (Push type data is displayed continuously – col. 1, lines 33-41, lines 56-67, col. 5, lines 19-21).

As for claim 9, Takahashi discloses the screen indicia comprises at least one graphical image – col. 3, lines 40-45, Fig. 1C.

As for claim 10, Takahashi discloses the screen indicia comprises a combination of text and at least one graphical image – col. 3, lines 40-45, Fig. 1C.

As for claim 11, Takahashi discloses wherein the display screen is a liquid crystal display – col. 3, lines 16-20.

As for claim 12, Takahashi discloses the display screen is capable to be detached from the client terminal – col. 3, lines 26-30.

As for claim 13, Takahashi discloses the display screen is capable to present a plurality of indicia (Displays sports, news, weather. Fig. 1A-1C; col. 3, lines 20-24).

As for claims 14, 27, and 48, Takahashi discloses in an interactive video casting network, a method comprising:

A means (1 – Fig. 1A) for dynamically receiving data related to an event available via a client terminal (1 – Fig. 1A) for a television; - col. 3, lines 60-63

A means (21 – Fig. 5) for processing (demodulating) the received data to generate indicia indicative of the event; - col. 3, lines 60-66

A means (29 – Fig. 5) for presenting the generated indicia as a screen element via a display screen (2 – Fig. 1A) for the client terminal at least alternatively to presenting the generated indicia on a screen of the television. – col. 4, lines 14-20

As for claim 15, Takahashi discloses wherein the display screen covers substantially an entire front of the client terminal (Referring to Fig. 1A- 1C, the display screen (2) covers substantially an entire front of the client terminal).

As for claim 28, Takahashi teaches wherein the data source comprises an Internet – col. 4, lines 45-48, col. 5, lines 1-6.

As for claim 34, Takahashi discloses wherein the events are capable to be received by Ethernet and telephone connection – (Fig. 5, col. 3, lines 45-51).

3. Claims 39-41 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Mitchell (2002/0162120).

As for claim 39, Mitchell teaches in an interactive video casting system, a method comprising:

receiving a trigger in conjunction with a broadcast content signal – [0028], [0077];

obtaining an event represented by the trigger; generating screen indicia (supplemental content) of the obtained event – [0077];

and displaying the generated screen indicia on a display for a client terminal (remote device 204 – Fig. 2) for a television, wherein the screen indicia is capable of being displayed at least alternatively to being displayed on the television – [0077].

As for claim 40, Mitchell discloses the trigger comprises a television trigger inserted into the broadcast content signal – [0028], [0077].

As for claim 41, Mitchell discloses obtaining the event represented by the trigger includes extracting information from a web page – (Accesses the internet - [0077]).

4. Claims 2 and 3 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Takahashi as applied to claim 1/2 above, and further in view of Medendorp (5764734).

As for claims 2 and 3, Takahashi fails to disclose the screen indicia includes indicia indicative of events available other than through the client terminal such as an incoming phone call alert.

In an analogous art, Medendorp teaches the screen indicia includes indicia indicative of events available other than through the client terminal such as an incoming phone call alert for the advantage of alerting a user that there is an incoming call. – col. 3, lines 22-25, col. 5, lines 7-8

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention to modify Takahashi's invention to include the screen indicia includes indicia indicative of events available other than through the client terminal such as an incoming phone call alert, as taught by Medendorp, for the advantage of alerting a user that there is an incoming call.

5. Claim 16 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Takahashi as applied to claim 16 above, and further in view of Tanigawa (5648813).

As for claim 16, Takahashi fails to disclose wherein the display screen includes soft buttons.

In an analogous art, Tanigawa teaches wherein the display screen includes soft buttons for the advantage of having a function which a physical button would have without taking up the space that a physical button would take – col. 26, lines 27-35, lines 47-57.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention to modify Takahashi's invention to include wherein the display screen includes soft buttons, as taught by Tanigawa, for the advantage of having a function which a physical button would have without taking up the space that a physical button would take.

6. Claims 17 and 19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Takahashi as applied to claim 14 above, and further in view of White (6392664).

As for claim 17, Takahashi fails to disclose wherein processing the received data includes generating indicia consistent with user preferences.

In an analogous art, White teaches processing the received data includes generating indicia consistent with user preferences for the advantage of allowing the user to control the type of information that is displayed – col. 7, lines 53-63.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention to modify Takahashi's invention to include wherein processing the received data includes generating indicia consistent with user preferences, as taught by White, for the advantage of allowing the user to control the type of information that is displayed.

As for claim 19, Takahashi and White disclose the claimed limitations. In particular, White discloses the user preferences include preferences related to a category of event related to the generated indicia – col. 7, lines 36-44.

7. Claim 18 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Takahashi and White as applied to claim 17 above, and further in view of Slowe (6928087).

As for claim 18, Takahashi and White fail to disclose the user preferences include preferences related to a format of the generated indicia.

In an analogous art, Slowe teaches the user preferences include preferences related to a format of the displayed data (preference for MPEG 4 video, JPEG – col. 6, lines 10-20).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention to modify Takahashi and White's invention to include the user preferences include preferences related to a format of the displayed data, as taught by

Slowe, for the advantage of allowing the user to choose the type of format data received.

8. Claims 21-23, and 37-38 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Takahashi as applied to claims 14 and 36 above, and further in view of Bonneau (4510623).

As for claims 21 and 22, Takahashi discloses an STB. However, he fails to disclose presenting indicia related to an operational feature such as the channel number of the client terminal.

In an analogous art, Bonneau teaches presenting the channel number on the client or television receiver – col. 10, lines 1-3.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention to modify Takahashi's invention to include presenting the channel number on the television receiver, as taught by Bonneau, for the advantage of informing the currently displayed channel to the user.

As for claim 23, Takahashi teaches presenting indicia of an event. However, Takahashi fails to teach presenting it along with an operational feature.

In an analogous art, as discussed above, Bonneau teaches presenting an operational feature such as presenting the channel number.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention to modify Takahashi's invention to include presenting an operational feature such as the channel number, as taught by Bonneau, for the advantage of informing the user of the current channel tuned to along with the event information.

As for claim 37, Takahashi fails to teach wherein the display screen is further capable to present indicia of operational features related to the client terminal.

In an analogous art, Bonneau teaches presenting the channel number on the client or television receiver – col. 10, lines 1-3.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention to modify Takahashi's invention to include presenting the channel number on the television receiver, as taught by Bonneau, for the advantage of informing the currently displayed channel to the user.

Claim 38 contains the limitations of claim 23 and is analyzed as previously discussed with respect to that claim.

9. Claims 6, 25, and 29 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Takahashi as applied to claims 1, 14, or 27 above, and further in view of Cowe (5495283).

As for claim 6,Takahashi fails to disclose the screen indicia comprises static text.

In an analogous art, Cowe teaches that static text is displayed to the user – col. 11, lines 16-35.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention to modify Takahashi's invention to include that static text is displayed to the user, as taught by Cowe, for the advantage of providing the user with a message which doesn't scroll ensuring that no viewers will miss the message.

As for claims 25 and 29, Takahashi fails to disclose presenting the generated indicia as sound.

In an analogous art, Cowe teaches presenting the generated indicia as sound – col. 8, lines 26-30, col. 9, lines 22-43, lines 55-60.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention to modify Takahashi's invention to include presenting the generated indicia as sound, as taught by Cowe, for the advantage of alerting the viewer of an event through audible means.

10. Claim 8 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Takahashi as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Munsil (5761650).

As for claim 8, Takahasi fails to disclose the screen indicia comprises a combination of dynamic and static text.

In an analogous art, Munsil teaches the screen indicia comprises a combination of dynamic and static text for the advantage of displaying both unchanging text and variable information on a single screen to the user – col. 5, lines 35-45.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention to modify Takahashi's invention to include the screen indicia comprises a combination of dynamic and static text for the advantage of, as taught by Munsil, for the advantage of displaying both unchanging text and variable information on a single screen to the user.

11. Claim 24 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Takahashi as applied to claim 14 above, and further in view of Mitchell (2002/0162120).

As for claim 24, Takahashi fails to disclose the received data is sent along with a trigger that accompanies a broadcast television signal received by the client terminal.

In an analogous art, Mitchell teaches the received data is sent along with a trigger that accompanies a broadcast television signal received by the client terminal for the advantage of simplifying the transmission of signals sent to the client end by transmitting the data in one stream – [0028], [0077].

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention to modify Takhashi's invention to include the received data is sent along with a trigger that accompanies a broadcast television signal received by the

client terminal, as taught by Mitchell, for the advantage of simplifying the transmission of signals sent to the client end by transmitting all of the data in one stream.

12. Claim 26 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Takahashi and Cowe as applied to claim 25 above, and further in view of Eda (5,760,820).

As for claim 26, Takahashi and Cowe fail to disclose the generated indicia includes an emergency alert tone.

In an analogous art, Eda discloses an alert tone is generated for the advantage of indicating the start of the text to be displayed as emergency information – col. 14, lines 55-62, col. 13, lines 43-55.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention to modify Takahashi and Cowe's invention to include an alert tone is generated, as taught by Eda, for the advantage of indicating the start of the text to be displayed as emergency information.

13. Claims 30-33 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Takahashi as applied to claim 27 above, and further in view of Koba (6222947).

As for claim 30, Takahashi fails to teach a storage medium coupled to the client terminal, the storage medium capable to store data related to a customization of the screen indicia.

In an analogous art, Koba discloses a storage medium (6 – Fig. 1) coupled to a client terminal (10 – Fig. 1), the storage medium capable to store data related to a customization of the screen indicia (col. 8, lines 1-5, col. 4, lines 28-44, col. 5, lines 34-56).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention to modify Takahashi's invention to include a storage medium coupled to the client terminal, the storage medium capable to store data related to a customization of the screen indicia, as taught by Koba, for the advantage of saving the user's screen format or layout.

As for claim 31, Takahashi and Koba disclose the claimed limitations. In particular, Takahashi teaches wherein the data related to the customization of the screen indicia includes data related to a sequence and content of the screen indicia. Referring to Fig. 8, the shaded ticker file is sequence information and the other files are the content indicia – col. 4, lines 49-65.

As for claim 32, Takahashi and Koba disclose the claimed limitations. In particular, Takahashi teaches wherein the sequence of the screen indicia is related to an order of presentation of screen indicia related to different events. – col. 4, lines 49-65

As for claim 33, Takahashi fails to teach a storage medium capable to store software to process user-preferences related to presentation of the screen indicia.

In an analogous art, Koba teaches wherein the storage medium processes user-preferences related to presentation of screen indicia. Since the storage medium processes data, there is software in the storage medium. – col. 4, lines 28-44, col. 5, lines 34-56, and col. 8, lines 1-14.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention to modify Takahashi's invention to include a storage medium capable to store software to process user-preferences related to presentation of the screen indicia, as taught by Koba, for the advantage of limiting the amount of processing that occurs at the client terminal by having the processing occur at the external storage medium.

14. Claim 35 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Takahashi as applied to claim 27 above, and further in view of Dyer (6903779).

As for claim 35, Takahashi fails to disclose the dynamically received events include closed captions.

In an analogous art, Dyer teaches the receiver dynamically receives closed captions – col. 5, lines 15-21.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention to modify Takahashi's invention to include the dynamically received events include closed captions, as taught by Dyer, for the hearing impaired.

15. Claims 42 and 43 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Takahashi in view of Sheedy (7017174).

As for claim 42, Takahashi discloses an apparatus, comprising:

a client terminal (1 – Fig. 1A) for a television (4 – Fig. 2) for an interactive video casting system (Referring to Fig. 5, the system transmits and receives data to the client terminal. The demodulator demodulates data inputted from a cable and the modulator outputs data to the cable. Hence, the system is a two-way system. – col. 3, lines 16-30),

wherein the television includes a screen (video display screen of television) to display information available from the interactive video casting system (col. 3, lines 33-36),

wherein the television is coupled to the client terminal – col. 3, lines 26-31,

wherein the client terminal is capable of being communicatively coupled to the interactive video casting system to receive the information available from the interactive video casting system and to cause presentation of at least some of the information on the screen of the television – col. 3, lines 40-51, lines 60-64

a display area (2 – Fig. 1A) coupled to the client terminal, wherein the display area is capable to present screen indicia of events dynamically received from the interactive video casting system – col. 3, lines 15-25

wherein the display area of the client terminal is capable to present the screen indicia at least alternatively to presentation on the screen of the television – col. 3, lines 15-25.

However, Takahashi fails to teach:

a) wherein the interactive video casting system includes a plurality of content sources communicatively coupled to a plurality of broadcast centers,

b) wherein the broadcast centers are coupled to storage units to store at least some of the information to be made available to the client terminal,

c) wherein the interactive video casting system is capable to provide the information to the client terminal via different communication channels, including at least one of a plurality of television broadcast channels and a communication channel with a communication network;

In an analogous art, Sheedy teaches:

wherein the interactive video casting system includes a plurality of content sources (107, 109, 111, 113 – Fig. 1) communicatively coupled to a plurality of broadcast centers (101 – Fig. 1. Although not illustrated, there are a plurality of broadcast centers to serve the wide array of client terminals since one broadcast center is not capable of serving every single client terminal) - (col. 2, line 63 – col. 3, line 25)

wherein the broadcast centers are coupled to storage units (105 – Fig. 1) to store at least some of the information to be made available to the client terminal (col. 7, lines 8-15),

wherein the interactive video casting system is capable to provide the information to the client terminal via different communication channels, including at least one of a plurality of television broadcast channels (col. 9, lines 5-14) and a communication channel with a communication network (col. 3, lines 44-58);

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention to modify Takahashi's invention to include steps a) – c), as taught by Sheedy, for the advantage of providing the users a wide array of content.

As for claim 43, Takahashi and Sheedy disclose the claimed limitations. In particular, Takahashi discloses the display area is detachable from the client terminal – col. 3, lines 26-30.

16. Claim 44 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Takahashi and Sheedy as applied to claim 42 above, and further in view of Cowe (5495283).

As for claim 44, Takahashi and Sheedy fail to disclose the client terminal is capable to present an audible indicator representative of a received event.

In an analogous art, In an analogous art, Cowe teaches presenting the generated indicia as sound – col. 8, lines 26-30, col. 9, lines 22-43, lines 55-60.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention to modify Takahashi and Sheedy's invention to include presenting the generated indicia as sound, as taught by Cowe, for the advantage of alerting the viewer of an event through audible means.

17. Claims 45-47 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Takahashi and Sheedy in view of White (6,392,664).

Claim 45 contains the limitations of claim 42 and is analyzed as previously discussed with respect to that claim. Claim 45 additionally discloses the following:

wherein the display area is capable to display the screen indicia based on user preferences

In an analogous art, White teaches processing the received data includes generating indicia consistent with user preferences for the advantage of allowing the user to control the type of information that is displayed – col. 7, lines 53-63.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention to modify Takahashi and Sheedy's invention to include wherein processing the received data includes generating indicia consistent with user preferences, as taught by White, for the advantage of allowing the user to control the type of information that is displayed.

As for claim 46, Takahashi, Sheedy, and White disclose the claimed limitations. In particular, Takahashi teaches the display area is capable of being detached from the client terminal - col. 3, lines 26-30.

As for claim 47, Takahashi, Sheedy, and White disclose the claimed limitations. In particular, Sheedy discloses wherein the broadcast centers (107, 109, 111, 113 – Fig. 1) comprise part of a satellite delivery system (col. 3, lines 1-12).

18. Claim 49 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Takahashi as applied to claim 48 above, and further in view of White.

As for claim 49, Takahashi fails to disclose wherein the means for processing the received data includes a means for generating indicia consistent with user preferences.

In an analogous art, White teaches the means (38 – Fig. 3) for processing the received data includes generating indicia consistent with user preferences for the advantage of allowing the user to control the type of information that is displayed – col. 7, lines 53-63.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention to modify Takahashi's invention to include a means for processing the received data includes generating indicia consistent with user preferences, as

taught by White, for the advantage of allowing the user to control the type of information that is displayed.

19. Claim 50 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Takahashi as applied to claim 48 above, and further in view of Mitchell (US 2002/0162120).

As for claim 50, Takahashi fails to teach wherein the received data is sent along with a trigger that accompanies a broadcast television signal received by the client terminal.

In an analogous art, Mitchell teaches the received data is sent along with a trigger that accompanies a broadcast television signal received by the client terminal for the advantage of simplifying the transmission of signals sent to the client end by transmitting the data in one stream – [0028], [0077].

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention to modify Takahashi's invention to include the received data is sent along with a trigger that accompanies a broadcast television signal received by the client terminal, as taught by Mitchell, for the advantage of simplifying the transmission of signals sent to the client end by transmitting all of the data in one stream.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Sumaiya A. Chowdhury whose telephone number is (571) 272-8567. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon-Fri, 9-5:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Chris Grant can be reached on (571) 272-7292. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

SAC

CHRISTOPHER GRANT
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2600